THE
Vanity and Falsity
OF THE
HISTORY
OF
Passive Obedience
DETECTED.

Wherein is briefly Demonstrated, That the First Reformers were far from Maintaining it in the Author of that History and his Party's Sence.

AS ALSO

It is plainly Evinced that it cannot be deduced from the Homilies, Articles, Injunctions or Canons, Liturgy and Bishops of the *Primitive English Church*. And all the specious Pretences he makes for it are fully Answered.

By *Tim. Wilson*, M. A. and Rector of *Kings Noth* in *Kent*.

Licens'd according to Order.

Prov. XXIII. 23.
Buy the Truth, and Sell it not.
Beloved, believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, whether they are of God, because many false Prophets are gone out into the World, 1 St. John. IV. 1.

LONDON, Printed by *George Croom*, at the *Blew-Ball* in *Thames-street*, near *Baynard's-Castle*. 1690.

10

THE Vanity and Falsity OF THE HISTORY OF Passive Obedience, &c.

THE History of *Passive Obedience* since the Reformation, tells us, That it was the Doctrine of all Ages.

To which I return this plain Answer: Our Noble and Blessed Reformers, and all Protestant Divines (as we who oppose *Passive Obedience*, do at this day) declare, that the King's Power is of God, yea, that all Power is of God; that Kings are God's Ministers and Vice-gerents; that they are God's Ordinance, and are not to be Resisted, but Obeyed; not only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake: That God is the only Ruler of Princes; that neither Heresie nor Infidelity absolve Subjects from their Allegiance and Duty to Kings. This, and the like is granted on all hands. And this is all that I could ever Collect from the Homilies, Articles, Injunctions, or Canons, Liturgy, and first Bishops of the Protestant *English Church*.

So that I shall premise these General Rules, for the understanding of the Judgment of the first Reformers, and of other later Divines by him mentioned.

First, Either they speak against Faction, Sedition, and Rebellion, in very large and general Terms; as all Divines, even those of our Perswasion, do, as a most heinous and unnatural wickedness, without stating any particular Case.

Or, *Secondly*, They speak of Kings Ruling according to the Laws of their Country. Suppose I should say in a Sermon, *Good Christian People, ye must in no case, or for no cause Resist King* William, *for he that Resisteth, shall receive to himself Damnation.* Would any Man (who knows my judgment) from such words conclude, that I am for *Passive Obedience*? Would they not rather conclude, that I am zealous for obedience to the King, and harbour no jealousie of my Governors, but have a strong presumption that he will Rule according to Law; do what is Right, and that his Subjects may lead a quiet and peaceable Life, in all Godliness and Honesty: And, doing their Duty, may assure themselves of all the benefits of good Government: The Apostle saith, *Whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that Resist, shall*

...ge to themſelves Damnation. The Homilies ... We muſt in no caſe reſiſt; and that it ... not Lawful for Inferiors and Subjects in any ...ſe to reſiſt and ſtand againſt the Superior Pow... (I hope this Author will acknowledge, that ...e Homilies ſpeak in the ſame ſence with St. ...aul) We ſay ſo too.

But the Queſtion is, whether *Paul* calls Defen...ve Arms againſt Illegal Proceedings and Univer...l Oppreſſion Damnable Reſiſtance. We ſay, ...at it is not the Reſiſtance of which St. *Paul* ...peaks. And the Author brings no Reaſon to ...rove it is. But we give Reaſons for our Inter...pretation. And this is one; Neither God, nor ...an gives Authority to Governors to Oppreſs. ...ear what a Learned Man and a grave Divine ſaith, ... The Apoſtle doth not ſay expreſly, Whoſoever ... reſiſteth the Higheſt Men ſhall receive Damna... tion, but whoſoever ſhall reſiſt the Power. ... Let every one be ſubject, not to the will of the ... Higheſt Men, but to the Higher Powers. ...There is a great deal of difference between theſe ...wo. The Higher Powers, that is, that Autho...ity that God and man hath put upon ſuch a Man. ...It is Ἐξουσία, not Δυνάμις, that muſt be Sub...jected to, and not Reſiſted. We profeſs againſt ...reſiſting Power, Authority, though abuſed. If ...they who have power to make Laws, ſhall make ...ſinful Laws, and ſo give Authority to any to force ...Obedience, we ſay here, there muſt be either Fly...ing, or *Paſſive Obedience*. But if one that is in Authority commands out of his own will, and not by Law, I Reſiſt no Power, no Authority at all, if I neither Actively, nor Paſſively Obey: No, I do not ſo much as reſiſt abuſed Authority. This may ſeem ſtrange at firſt, but if you think of it, you will believe it. We diſtinguiſh between the Man that hath the Power, and the Power of that Man, and ſay though the Power muſt not be Reſiſted according to the letter and ſenſe of the Text, yet the Illegal Will and Ways of the Man may be Reſiſted, without the leaſt Offence againſt the Text. But of the Homilies I ſhall ſpeak in due place.

Or, *Thirdly*, They ſpeak of Perſonal Infirmities and Crimes of Princes, of which God alone is the Avenger and Judge.

Or, *Fourthly*, They ſpeak of Tyranny in Exerciſe, when Laws enable Princes to Execute cruel Edicts, or when wicked Laws are made, and put in Execution; which is called the Abuſe of Power. In which caſe we own *Paſſive Obedience*, in Imitation of the Primitive Chriſtians. And ſo it was in Queen *Mary*'s days.

Or, *Fifthly*, They hyperbolize in zealous Expreſſions from an abhorrence of Rebellion, and due Reverence of Sacred Majeſty and Crowned Heads, God's Anointed, and Princes of greateſt Merit and Renown. As if I ſhould ſay of His preſent Majeſty, (in an Extaſie of Joy upon Meditation of our great Deliverance) He is the Earthly God and Saviour of *England*: Could any from hence rationally infer, that I deny Defenſive Arms in ſome caſe?

Or, *Sixthly*, They Write in times wherein Arbitrary power and Innovations got footing: And ſo out of blind Zeal, and (as I may ſay) Superſtitious Devotion to Princes; or out of Prejudice; or they were Court-paraſites and Flatterers, as *Mountague*, *Manwaring*, *Sibthorp*, *Parker*, *Cartwright*, &c. or poſſeſſed with ſome other evil Affection: Or they wrote zealouſly againſt the *Pope's* Supremacy, and his pretended power of Excommunicating and Depoſing Kings, and againſt the Aſſaſſination and Murdering of Princes, juſtified by ſome Jeſuits moſt Audaciouſly.

Or, *Laſtly*, They have ſpoken their own Sentiments and private Opinions, not the Doctrine of the *Church of England*; and have been oppoſed by others in all times, (ſometimes Secretly, ſometimes Openly) of the ſame Communion and Church; and by Men of as great Knowledge, Piety, and Loyalty both to King and Country: And theſe have been both of the Clergy and Laity, as far as with due Reverence to their Superiors they could. But ſurely no man in his Senſes, can think that a whole Kingdom is to be made a Sacrifice to the perverſe Will and Luſt of a Tyrant, who diſpenſeth with all Laws, and is reſolved to Rule Arbitrarily, and will hearken to no Petitions, &c.

And thus having premiſed theſe general Rules for our plain Underſtanding, I deſcend to the particulars of this Hiſtory. And firſt, I will conſider his *Preface*.

He begins thus. *Having always thought, that the Doctrine of* Paſſive Obedience, *or Non-reſiſtance of our Lawful Superiors, had been a Doctrine founded in the Holy Scriptures, recommended to the Chriſtian World by the Precepts and Examples of our Bleſſed Saviour, and the Practice of his more immediate Followers; which Copy the* Church of England *hath exactly Tranſcribed, to whoſe Immortal Glory it muſt be ſaid, that ſhe alone (in contradiſtinction both to Papiſts and Diſſenters) hath aſſerted the Principles of Obedience to Princes, as the beſt Ages of Chriſtianity own'd, and practiſed it.*

Anſw.

Answ. This Author's Thoughts are no Rule for us to live by: And I make no question (if he will lay aside Prejudice) but that he will see reason to change his mind, and to acknowledge, that *Passive Obedience* in his sense, is no Doctrine founded in the Holy Scriptures, *&c.* And that the *Church of England* hath transcribed no such Copy as he speaks of. For it would be not the Immortal Glory, but the Everlasting Shame of the Bishops and Clergy, to justifie such Doctrine as must necessarily bring Slavery upon their Native Country. As if Christ came into the World not to save mankind, but destroy it; and God had left all Political Society to be a Prey to Wolves: For so Tyrants are called.

Obj. The matter of Fact as to the first Ages of Reformation, is denied: (So the Author brings us in objecting) while some affirm, that the Tenet is no older than Arch-bishop *Laud*, and was introduced by a few Court-Bishops, the better to make way for the attaining and establishing of their own Grandeur.

Answ. We say, that the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience* in this Authors sense, was not taught by the first Blessed Reformers; and that it began about the latter end of the Reign of King *James* the First, as we hope to prove in the following Discourse. And we fear Temporal Interest, and somewhat of the humour of *Diotrephes*, who loved to have the Preheminence, more than Zeal to propagate the Truth of the Gospel brought into the Church this, and some other like Doctrines, to which we say, our first Reformers were wholly Strangers.

Obj. The Doctrine of *Passive Obedience* cannot be unseasonable, since no Government can be safe without it.

Answ. Some Men have a great fondness for their own Opinions. Is there any Kingdom, State, or Government in Christendom, that thinks as this Author Writes? And must his *Ipse Dixit* suffice? For he offers no Reason. Is there no way to avoid Faction, Sedition, and Rebellion, but by teaching Men to deny their Senses, and be calm, like innocent Lambs, while the most Barbarous *Papists* would cut their Throats, and ruine their Posterity?

What if Lewd Libellers, as *Parsons* the Jesuit, *Milton*, &c. Traduce the best of God's Anointed? And what if Rebels Murder the best of Kings, must not therefore the Innocent defend themselves? Was *David* Wicked for defending himself by force of Arms against the Tyranny of *Saul*, because *Absalom* was a Rebel, and exposed his Fathers admirable Reign? It is the Cause makes a thing Just, or Unjust. Every Sophister may see the Fallacy of such Arguments. I am sure *Passive Obedience* was so unseasonable in our days, that it had almost Ruined the most Glorious National Church upon Earth, and threatned Laws, Liberty, and Property. Such advantage had the impudent *Jesuits* made of it.

Obj. Did we seriously study the Laws of Providence, and consider the indispensible Obligation laid on us of taking up the Cross: Did we remember that Affliction is the Churches Portion; and that not the least Evil may be done to procure the greatest Good, this Doctrine would be more easily Believed, and more readily Embraced.

Answ. God's Providence and Human Prudence, are not Inconsistent. But God requires of us the use of Means to deliver our selves out of Affliction. And we say in some case it is so far from being Evil, that it is a most Heroick Vertue, when God inspires the Nobles of a Nation to throw off the Yoak of Universal Oppression. And though Affliction is the Churches portion, yet if God gives us Halcyon days, or in our Distress we have opportunity to free our selves from *Egyptian* Task-masters, it is both Sin and Folly to continue in Bondage.

Obj. This is the Doctrine of *Hobbs*, and *Parsons* the Jesuit, *That Power is Originally in the Body of the People; that the Foundation of all Government is laid in Compact; and that the breach of Conditions by one Party, dispenseth with the Duty of the other, though confirmed with Sacraments, Oaths, and reiterated Promises.*

Answ. That all Government is a Trust, and founded in Covenant, I have elsewhere proved And though we say, that all Power is of God yet the Limitation, Qualification, and Designation of the Person, or Soveraign, and the Form of Regiment, is an Ordinance of Man. And we affirm, that if our Prince suffers in a good Cause, as in a Rebellion, we are bound to Suffer with him. And this is not *Hobbism*. But if *Hobbs* owns some Truths that we, and all wise Politicians, and most Reformed Divines own, is Truth the worse? What if the Devil said, *Jesus, thou Son of God*, must not we say so likewise? Leave off these foolish Imputations. As for the *Papists*, (as a Learned Divine hath observed) they hold and practise against this, and for this, and beyond this, as they see they may serve their own Turns. In their Practice, especially of late, they have laboured to infuse into the People, yea, and

into

into Princes, an opinion of their Abſolute Power, as conceiving it for the preſent moſt conducing to their ends, who have preached up that all is the King's; that his Will is our Law; that all Grants are but Acts of Grace; that whatſoever he Commands, muſt be obey'd, either by Doing, or Suffering.

Of a like nature is that childiſh Inſinuation, if not willful Calumny, that we are not obedient to our Soveraign, becauſe he is God's Vice-gerent, and becauſe God hath obliged us to be ſubject, not only for Wrath, but for Conſcience ſake: And that we are Obedient and Loyal only, becauſe our Compliance advanceth our Deſigns, &c. This is a *Machiavellian* trick, and unworthy of a Diſputant.

Sir, I beſeech you conſider that we are about a caſe of Conſcience of greateſt concern to the whole Kingdom; and uſe Arguments, or relate Authorities; and do not act the part of a Slanderer, inſtead of an Hiſtorian. For we take our ſelves to have as good a Conſcience in this matter as you, be you who you will. And if we know our own Hearts, had no deſign in this great Revolution, but delivering our ſelves, and our Poſterity from *Popery* and *Slavery*. So much for the *Preface*.

Let us go on to the *Introduction*.

And here I agree with the Author about the Interpretation of the Counſel of our Holy Saviour, St. *Matt.* 7. 15, 16. who when he bids us to *Beware of falſe Prophets, who come in Sheeps Clothing, but inwardly are ravening Wolves*, cautions us, that *we ſhall know them by their Fruits*. That is, not by the Fruits of their Lives, but of their Doctrine. Now we ſay, the natural conſequences of *Paſſive Obedience*, when we have a willful or wicked Prince, are Arbitrary Power, Oppreſſion, Tyranny, Popery, Slavery, Invalidating of Laws, Obſtructions of publick Juſtice, and any Grievance that can befall a Nation. I wiſh we had not ſeen theſe Evils with our own Eyes. But then perhaps we ſhould have been hard put to it to make this Author, and men of his Perſwaſion, to believe the many horrid Miſchiefs which plainly follow ſuch flattering Doctrine.

Likewiſe I acknowledge, that if we would judge of the Doctrines of our Church, we muſt conſult her Articles, Canons, publick Homilies, Publick Offices of Devotion, General Orders of her Biſhops, Cenſures of her Univerſities, and Writings of her Great Men, who have Vindicated her Doctrine, and explained her Belief.

I proceed to the Firſt Chapter, according to this method, which contains the Doctrine of the 39 Articles.

Anno 1552. In the *Convocation* held at *London*, Articles of Religion were agreed upon, of which the Thirty ſixth runs thus,

The Civil Magiſtrate is Ordained and allowed of God, and therefore is to be Obeyed, not only for Wrath, but alſo for Conſcience ſake. And expreſly aſſerts, *that the Biſhop of* Rome *hath no Juriſdiction in this Realm of* England.

In the Articles of our Church under Queen *Elizabeth*, Anno 1562. it runs thus, and ſo continues to this day.

The Queens Majeſty hath the chief Power in this Realm of England, *and other her Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Eſtates of this Realm, whether they be Eccleſiaſtical, or Civil, in all caſes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be ſubject to any Foreign Juriſdiction.*

Anſw. Surely no man, who bears the name of a Proteſtant, ever denied this. But I imagine, that if *Paſſive Obedience* had been ſuch a peculiar and Characteriſtical Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as we have been perſwaded of late to believe, we ſhould have had an Article againſt Defenſive Arms in any caſe; and it would have been condemned as a factious, ſeditious and rebellious Principle, if it deſerved Damnation, as this Author ſpeaks often times. I expected plain right down Engliſh to condemn ſuch wicked and dangerous Doctrine, but I find not one word about it in the Articles, nor can this Author. Which is to me a ſtrong preſumption, that the firſt Reformers medled not with this as an Article of Religion.

And this Author confeſſeth pag. 4. That this Doctrine is not limited to the particular caſe of Subjects taking up Arms. Well, but it ſeems to him by two neceſſary Conſequences to be deduced from it.

Let us hear them. Firſt, *Becauſe if the Pope, who pretends by Divine Right, had no power over Kings, much leſs have the People any Power, who pretend to an Inferior Right, that of Compact.* (As if by the way the People had not a Divine right to Defend themſelves: Which Law of Nature is certainly the Law of God unwritten, and is only in Man's Heart.)

Secondly. *Becauſe the Article makes no Diſtinction, but Excludes all other Power as well as that of the Pope.*

Anſw. All that the Article Diſclaims is the Uſurped Power of the Pope: And all that it declares is, the Supream Power of the King over all Perſons

Perſons in his Dominions. But the firſt Reformers were not ſo ſenſeleſs as to ſpeak a word againſt the Peoples power of Self-preſervation. And who among us ſaith, that the People have Power or Juriſdiction over their *Prince*, (when we ſay that they are not Rulers, or in Office) but they have a Power of Self-preſervation? And if a Prince ſeeks their Ruine cauſeleſsly, they may Defend themſelves by the Law of Nature, and compel him to keep his Covenant and Oath, the good of the whole Kingdom being the end of all Government. And if they can no longer truſt him with their Safety, becauſe he hath willfully broken his Promiſes, they may Elect one whom they can Truſt; and they are not bound to be Paſſive under Illegal Oppreſſions. God Reſt the Soul of this Author for his honeſt ſimplicity and well-meaning; but I would gladly ſee his Logick in Mood and Figure. For verily, I conceive, that no Conſcientious and Wiſe Man, who is for *Paſſive Obedience*, did ever dream that this Article denied Defenſive Arms. And for me it ſhall go for the peculiar Fancy of the Author.

We ſay that the Power of the King is of God; but we ſay alſo that Originally they were Elected by the People. And Dr. *Fern* acknowledgeth, That it was probably ſo at firſt in this Nation. But we ſay that it was certainly ſo, not only in this, but in all the Kingdoms of the World. See *Polydore Virgil*, the Book called the *Mirror*, *Bracton*, *Forteſcue*, &c. And for 2970 years, or thereabouts, (as Chronologers compute) that is, from *Adam* to *Rehoboam*, there was no Lineal Deſcent, or Hereditary Succeſſion among God's own People. And it muſt be confeſſed by all, That if the Royal Line ſhould fail in any Kingdom, there muſt be Election, for God doth not now work Miracles, nor ſend extraordinary Prophets to Anoint Kings; but he whom the People in ſuch caſe would chuſe, is God's Anointed, and to him all owe Obedience. I ſhall ſay no more at this time about this firſt Chapter: Only I cannot but obſerve, that though this Author pretends to the Meekneſs and Spirit of *Chriſt Jeſus*, yet he is very prone to Calumniate his Antagoniſts. For who ever of our ſide in his Wits, ſaid, that the People are the Interpreters of the meaning of the Laws, as he ſpeaks *p.* 4. And if any ever ſaid, that the Parliament, the Repreſentatives of the People, and the Higheſt Court of the Kingdom, are the Interpreters of the meaning of the Laws, it muſt be underſtood with ſuch Exceptions as theſe, That they have not Arbitrary Power; That they are not Infallible; That they muſt be guided by right Reaſon, &c. But there needs no great Conſultation in caſe of Univerſal Oppreſſion: (In which caſe alone we juſtifie Defenſive Arms) for it is a thing ſenſible, and we have Experience of it, or feel it, and cannot deny our Senſes, but are forced as ſenſible Creatures, to complain and deſire the Redreſs of our Grievances.

I go on to Chapter II. which contains the Injunctions and Canons.

Nothing but blind Zeal to maintain a Party that a Man hath eſpouſed, could move the Author to produce the Injunctions and Canons, made in the time of *Edward* the VI. and Queen *Elizabeth*, as aſſerting *Paſſive Obedience*, or condemning Defenſive Arms in ſome caſe; for all Orthodox Divines acknowledge every tittle to be true; and they overthrow the Pope's Supremacy in *England*, and all Foreign Juriſdiction. But the firſt Reformers of our Church had more Wiſdom and Moderation than to Condemn their Brethren of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, when both *Luther* and *Calvin* juſtified Defenſive Arms. And ſurely every wiſe and conſiderate Reader muſt needs Laugh at the palpable Folly and Weakneſs of this Author, to infer from theſe Injunctions and Canons, that *Paſſive Obedience* was the Characteriſtical Mark of the *Church of England* in thoſe days. He is Pur-blind with Prejudice, and ſo now the Sun ſhines bright and clear, he is better pleaſed with the Owl-light of his own Imagination. Surely we receive theſe Injunctions and Canons as the beginning of Reformation, with Hearts full of Joy. And I am fully of Opinion, that *Henry* VIII began at the Root, when he renounced the *Pope's* Supremacy.

But let us hear the Doctrine of the Injunctions and Canons.

In the Infancy of the Reformation, under *Henry* VIII. (for there I begin the Reſtoration of Religion to her purity in this Kingdom, as Dr. *Burnet* doth) *Anno* 1536. Injunctions were Iſſued out: The firſt of which is, *That every Man that hath Cure of Souls, ſhall for the Eſtabliſhing and Confirmation of the King's Authority and Juriſdiction, ſincerely declare, manifeſt and open for the ſpace of one quarter of a Year next enſuing, once every Sunday, and after that at leaſt wiſe twice every Quarter in their Sermons and other Collations, That the Biſhop of* Rome's *Uſurped Power and Juriſdiction having no Eſtabliſhment or Ground in the Law of God, was of moſt juſt cauſe, taken away and Aboliſhed—And that the King's Power in his Dominions, is the Higheſt Power and Potentate under God, to*

whom

whom all Men within the same Dominions, by Gods Command owe most Loyalty and Obedience, above and above all other Potentates on Earth.

I am so far from disowning any of this, that I wish it had been every Week published in every Market Town in the Reign of King *James* II. We always abhorred the Usurpations of the Bishop of *Rome*: And we always owned the King's Lawful Power and Authority. But we say, that if a King is resolved to Subject us to a Forreign Power, and to Dispense with all Laws made for our Security, Liberty and Property, and the Established Religion, we may hinder him from Cutting our Throats, and Defend our selves. And this is neither Rebellion nor Resistance, properly so called; but Natural Self preservation, against the Freaks and prodigious Melancholy Fits of a raging and beastly Tyrant, who with greatest Ingratitude would devour Friends as well as Foes.

But let us see his Inference *p.* 5. *Now if the King be above all other Powers, then he cannot be Accountable to any other Power, and so ought not to be Resisted.*

Answ. He that resists the Lust of a Tyrant, resists no Power, as hath been said often; because neither God nor Man gave him such Power. And though the King is above all Power, and it is not for me to meddle with the King's Prerogatives, or the Parliaments Priviledges, yet I may safely say, He is not above Law, which makes him King, as I shall shew anon out of the Fragments of Mr. *Hooker*'s Eighth Book. And it is a Sentence worthy to be written in Letters of Gold, which I find, (Εικ. Βασιλ. Sect. 5. *p.* 31. with me) King *Charles* the First mentioned, *More than the Law gives me I would not have, and less the meanest Subject should not.* And let me remind the Author that he saith in the *Preface*, that he only doth the office of an Historian, and intended not to promote any Disturbance. But here and elsewhere he cannot forbear his own Inferences, how unreasonable so ever they be.

Again he saith, *The Injunctions of the Lord* Cromwell, Edward VI. *and Queen* Elizabeth, *plainly distinguish the Claim of the Pope from other Claims, implying, That our Church always believed that her Princes Power was derived immediately from God, and that they were Superior to all their Subjects, either Singly, or Collectively, and so were not accountable to them, but only to God.*

Answ. No Mans private inferences and Opinions are the Doctrines of the Church. The Injunctions and Canons have left such a Latitude, that both Sides approve. Likeas the 17*th.* Article is of such a latitude, that both *Calvinists* and *Arminians* subscribe with Cheerfulness and a good Conscience. And this I take to be great Wisdom in our first Reformers. I wish those Bishops that Succeeded them had been as wise at all times. For let this Author imagine what he pleaseth, private Opinions, when urged as Doctrines of the Church, or made Characteristical Marks of the Church, have been the cause of all Disturbances in the Christian World. We all believe that the King's Power is of God; but that any one form of Regiment is derived immediately from God, is no Doctrine of our Church, nor of any Church; and is the first falshood in political Government; as I have shewed elsewhere. All Kings receive their power Mediately by the People. And Mr. *Hooker* saith, tho he is *singulis Major*, yet he is *universis Minor*. But my opinion is, this is according to the Constitution of every Kingdom, though no People can give away the right of Self-preservation.

I am weary of this *Cuckow* tune always the same thing. In short, the Canons of the Church of *England* are Innocent in this matter: And I would justifie our Church; but the Guilt of some and the Peevishness of others, will not suffer me. Such as these may call me an *Apostate* and *Presbyterian*, perhaps only because they are ashamed to confess their own Guilt. I profess my self as true a Son of the *Church of England* as any Man in *England*. And I always was, and am at this day, for Monarchy, Episcopacy and Liturgy, as Established by Law. And I humbly submit in all things of Order, Decency and Government, to the Fathers of the Church, and to the King and Parliament. And let Men sunk in Prejudice say what they will, this was always the Judgment of the Protestant *English* Church. If our Governors think fit to change things in their own nature changeable, every Subject is bound in Conscience to Obey. If they think not fit, be things as they are, I am contented.

Now as for the Canons of the year 1640, I confess they have a spice of Innovation. And I say, (I hope without offence to any Impartial considerer of those days) That Arbitrary Power began to creep upon us. And Arch-bishop *Laud* and his Party, nor the *Puritans* and their Party, are not to be justified in all things. And here I make my Appeal to *Rushworth*'s Collections, or any other impartial Record of those times. But I think the Author had better have buried these things in Silence. For how they tend to the Credit of the *Church of England*, I do not understand, and I need not descant upon them.

Let

Let us go on to Chap. III. which contains the Doctrine of the Homilies.

Here I ſhall not ſay with Mr. *Mountague*, (*Appeal. p.* 260.) I will admit the Homilies, as containing certain Godly and wholſom Exhortations; but not as publick Dogmatical Reſolutions, Confirmed of the *Church of England*. They have not Dogmatical Poſitions or Doctrines to be propugned and ſubſcribed in all and every point. They may ſeem to ſpeak ſomewhat too hard, and ſtretch ſome ſayings beyond the uſe and practice of the *Church of England*.

But with this Author I will account them admirable Sermons made by our firſt Reformers, as the Body of practical Divinity, and the Confutations of the Errors and Idolatries of the Church of *Rome*, &c.

And by the way I am Glad that the Homilies are allowed to confute the Idolatries of the Church of *Rome*. Becauſe not long ſince divers for *Paſſive Obedience* and *Non-reſiſtance*, denied that there was any Idolatry in the Church of *Rome*, to the great Scandal of our Mother the *Church of England*.

This premiſed, I affirm that if Mens thoughts may be known by their words, Dr. *Welw.* (Letter to Mr. *March*, *p.* 10.) might well ſay, That *Paſſive Obedience*, in the narrow ſenſe we take it in, was not ſo much as thought on at the time of publiſhing the Homilies.

Firſt, Becauſe the words *Paſſive Obedience* are not in the Homilies.

Secondly, Becauſe they do not ſtate our Caſe; which is this, If a King is reſolved to deſtroy the Religion by Law Eſtabliſhed, and Liberty and Property, and will rule by the Sword, contrary to the Fundamental Laws of the Kingdom, whether in this caſe Defenſive Arms are not Lawful? Now we ſay, the Compilers of the Homilies never condemned this: Neither are the words, *Defenſive Arms are Unlawful*, in the Homilies.

Thirdly, becauſe in thoſe days the Writings of many Divines of the Foreign Reformed Churches, in which Defenſive Arms were Juſtified, were approved, and publickly printed and owned by the Univerſities, or at leaſt not publickly Cenſured: As *Calvin*'s Inſtitutions, all *Luther*'s Works, and the Writings of *Peter Martyr*, &c.

And we ſay, that in popular Sermons, fitted to the Capacities of the Common people, many zealous and hyperbolical Expreſſions may be allowed, and favourably Interpreted, eſpecially againſt thoſe horrid Crimes of Sedition and Rebellion, which yet would ſcarce paſs in Dogmatical Deciſions. For theſe latter require dry Reaſon, and plain Scripture, without Rhetorications, or Metaphorical Expreſſions, Alluſions, or Illuſtrations.

I will put a Caſe. Suppoſe the Late King ſhould have ſent three or four Officers of his ſtanding Army to a Nobleman's Houſe, with a Commiſſion or Command to cut the Throats of his Children, Wife, and his Own; and theſe Officers ſhould have ſuch wicked Hearts as to endeavour to accompliſh this Villany: If in this caſe the Nobleman may defend himſelf by force of Arms againſt theſe Cut-throats, and call in his Neighbours to help him; then thoſe phraſes in the Homilies, In no caſe to Reſiſt; In any caſe it is not Lawful; we may not in any wiſe withſtand Violently, &c. muſt admit of the ſenſe that I put upon them. (And moſt aſſuredly thoſe Bleſſed Authors of Reformation abhorred ſuch bruitiſh Tyranny.)

And if this Author will not recant this diſmal Doctrine in the vaſt extent thereof, he muſt be in a deep Melancholy, and fitter for Dark Rooms, than to Converſe with Humane Society.

Again, I muſt confeſs, that the moſt barbarous, impudent, and brazen-fac'd Murder of our Royal Martyr King *Charles* the Firſt, a Prince of moſt excellent Virtues, and of ever bleſſed Memory, could do no leſs than provoke every Loyal Subject in *Parliament* to make a moſt Severe and Zealous Declaration about taking Arms againſt the King. But I believe in my Conſcience this Declaration never intended to Enſlave us, or never affirmed that if the King will cut our Throats, we may not defend our ſelves by the Law of Nature. So that my Interpretation muſt take place, that the *Phraſes* are not meant abſolutely in the utmoſt Extremity: For this would be to ſuppoſe that the *People* of *England* had choſen for their Repreſentatives in *Parliament*, men reſolved to make them Slaves, and not to preſerve Liberty and Property.

This, with the Diſtinctions before uſed, is a ſufficient Anſwer to any Man who hath no mind to be Obſtinate and Cavil, but contends for Truth not for Victory. Not to ſay that Biſhop *Jewel* and without pretence of Contradiction, Dr. *Biſſon* acknowledged Defenſive Arms Lawful in ſome caſe, in thoſe very days, and when he purpoſely handled the Subject or Controverſie.

Obſerve alſo the time, when the Homilies were made. They were compoſed in the happy Reigns of *Edward* VI. and Queen *Elizabeth*; in whoſe days there was no fear of *Popery*, or Arbitrary Power, on their parts; though ſome Beſotted Prieſts and People, that hated to be Reformed,

might Rebel against *Moses* and *Aaron*, and desire to return back into *Egyptian* Bondage and Slavery. And the Homilies were made chiefly to perswade such to Peace and Obedience to their Lawful Superiors, whom God had set over them, and to shew them the Heinousness of Rebelling against them: And may now with much profit be read to perswade all good Christian people of *England*, to Honour Reverence and Obey King *William* and Queen *Mary*, whom God's most Gracious providence hath placed on the Throne.

I descend to Chapter IV. which contains the Doctrine of the Liturgy.

Though I do not equal the Liturgy with the Word of God, nor take it to be absolutely unalterable, (nor doth the Church) yet I am of this Author's mind, That it is the most excellent Body of publick prayers that the World owns: Or, (as I have elsewhere expressed my self) If I should say, that there is no Church on Earth, which Worships God and Christ with greater Purity, Majesty, Reverence and expressions of Devotion, than the *English Protestant*, no Man could confute me. Particularly no Church in the World Prays more Zealously for Kings and Governors. And what this Author produceth out of the Liturgy was never disputed by any of us. We profess that God is the only Ruler of Princes; we pray that God would deliver us from all Sedition, privy Conspiracy, and Rebellion; we say, that King *William* and Queen *Mary* are God's Ministers, and we beg of God that all their Subjects duly considering that they have God's Authority, may faithfully Serve, Honour and humbly Obey them, according to God's blessed Word and Ordinance; and we pray God that the King may cut off all such workers of Iniquity, as turn Religion into Rebellion, and Faith into Faction; and we beseech God to accept of our unfeigned Oblation of our selves, vowing all Holy obedience in thought, word, and work unto the Divine Majesty, and promising in him, and for him, all Dutiful Allegiance to his Anointed Servants, and to their Heirs for ever.

But what is all this to *Passive Obedience?* This Author cannot be so Ignorant, as not to know that all Learned Divines, of what Perswasion soever, own this. Insomuch, that I must needs say, that as greatly as he pretends to the meekness and peaceableness of a Christian Spirit, he hath foully transgressed the Rule of Christian Charity, which commands to think no Evil, by insinuating that we allow of Sedition, Conspiracy, Rebellion, Faction, &c. And because he finds these words in the Liturgy, he infers, that the Liturgy is for *Passive Obedience*. But the very mentioning of this, is sufficient Confutation; and shews that the Author had more Zeal than Knowledge. And pray, Reader observe, that the Words *Passive Obedience asserted*, and *Defensive Arms condemned*, or the like, are not once to be found, either in the Articles, or in the Injunctions or Canons, or in the Homilies, or in the Liturgy. From whence I infer, that it was not the Doctrine of the first Reformers much less a Characteristical mark of a Son of the *Church of England*.

To answer all his Authorities were endless, tho I think many of them are nothing to the purpose. And the General Rules prescribed in the beginning of this Discourse will suffice; and the Learned Reader may make Application of them without Difficulty.

Wherefore, I shall only observe what the Author confesseth of the Meek, Wise, and ever renowned *Hooker*, *p.* 29. In this (i. Q. *Elizabeth's*) Reign, Mr. *Hooker* published his Judicious Books of *Ecclesiastical* Polity. From the first of which it must be confessed, it is observed, that he lays the Foundation of Government in Agreement, he herein following the Schools too strickly, &c.

And here by the way, he tells us that *Aristotle* was a great lover of Democracy. But I think he wrongs the Great Philosopher: For he seems to me to be a lover of Monarchy, though I confess he seems to like an Elective Kingdom. See his Book of Polities; especially Book III. Chap. 14.

But be it as it will, we are sure *Aristotle*, the School-men, and Mr. *Hooker*, are all ours in this Controversie.

And if Mr. *Hooker's* Eighth Book be Authentick, as Published by Dr. *Gauden* Bishop of *Exeter*, I desire no better Authority. See *p.* 190, &c. He mentions and approves the old Axiom, *Attribuat Rex Legi, quod Lex attribuit ei.* And again, *Rex non debet esse sub homine, sed sub Deo & Lege.*

Thirdly, Whereas it is altogether without reason, that Kings are judged to have by virtue of their Dominion, though greater Power than any, yet not then all the States of those Societies conjoyned, wherein such Soveraign Rule is given them; there is not any thing hereunto to the contrary by us affirmed; no, not when we grant Supream Authority to Kings: Because Supremacy is not otherwise intended or meant but to exclude partly Forreign Powers, and partly the Power which belongeth in several unto others, contained as parts in that Politick Body over which those

those Kings have Supremacy, &c. It hath been declared already in general, how the best Established Dominion is, where the Law doth most Rule the King, &c.

Again, *p.* 192. Every Independent multitude before any certain form of Regiment Established, hath under God, Supream Authority, full Dominion over it self, even as a man not tied with the Band of Subjection as yet unto any other, hath over himself the like power, &c. And, *p.* 103. That which we speak of Kings, shall be in respect of the State, and according to the nature of this Kingdom, where the People are in no Subjection, but such as willingly themselves have condescended unto for their own most behoof and Security. In Kingdoms therefore of this Quality, the Highest Governor hath indeed Universal Dominion, but with dependency upon that whole intire Body, over the several parts whereof he hath Dominion: So that it standeth for an Axiom in this case, the King is *Major Singulis, universis Minor.* &c Again, *p.* 195. The Axioms of our Regal Government are these, *Lex facit Regem Rex nihil potest nisi quod jure potest.*

I hope no man for the future, will deny that Mr. *Hooker* is of, my Opinion, that all Government is Founded in Covenant.

I have other Authors, whom I shall reserve, till I have further Occasion.

I shall at present only desire two things of this Author. First, I beg of him to shew how all Kings have received Power immediately from God: For I cannot apprehend his meaning.

Secondly, In what manner the Laws of Providence (of which he speaks) are to be understood in Governing the Kingdoms of the Earth. Let him plainly and sincerely declare his Judgment in these two Propositions, and then we may possibly come to a right Understanding. For verily these Notions seem to me like *Aristotle*'s Occult Qualities, or to border upon Enthusiasm.

And now to conclude, I am so confident of the truth of my Principles that I have, and will Sacrifice all that is dear to Man for them: I am sure they tend to the Glory of God, the propagation of the true Religion, the Honour and Safety of the King and Royal Family, and the happiness and welfare of my Native Country. And if we may judge Principles to be true by their good Fruits, we see the generality of the Nation very well pleased, Fearing God, and Honouring the King. And if we have any Murmurers they are declared *Papists*, or Souls seduced and corrupted by the false Principle of *Passive Obedience*, or Discontented, Lewd and Ungovernable Men, for all other Protestants give God and the King thanks for this Deliverance. And though we have the vast Charge of a *French* War, and great and sore Inconveniencies that attend divers particular Persons thereby, yet no man of Sense can be ignorant, that War cannot be maintained without Money. And therefore all Protestant Subjects and good Christians, bear the Charge freely without any Discontent, hoping and praying that God would give Success to his Majesties Armies, and Naval Forces; and that he would abate the Pride of that Monarch, who hath been the Scourge of *Christendom*.

And though I will not say, that this Author designed to move Sedition by this History; yet (if he could not satisfie his own Conscience, and Swear Allegiance to King *William* and Queen *Mary*) I think he might have spared his great pains in this numerous Collection of Testimonies: For surely this History doth not tend to the Reputation of some of the late Doctors of the Church of *England*, and I have shewed that the first Reformers preached no such Doctrine: Insomuch that I could imagine the Author of this History to be some Subtle *Jesuit*, personating a Protestant, on purpose to expose the Nakedness of late Divines, who through Prejudice insensibly prepared the way to that which I am sure they Abhorred, *Popery*, and Arbitrary power. But this, which hath been the Bane of the King and Nation, and the Incendiary of all parties, is now out of Doors. And we have a Gracious Soveraign whom God hath raised up in our great Distress, in pity to his People, and Mercy to this Land. When the *Popish* Enemy would come in like a Flood, the Spirit of the Lord hath lift up a Standard against him. And our Prince is our Deliverer from heavy Burthens; our Reformer of great Corruptions; the Physician of a Diseased Church and State.

And if some little Men Murmur against *Moses* and *Aaron*, (like *Corah* and his Company) It is because they prefer *Egyptian* Onions to the Dainties of *Canaan*. I hope the time is at hand, when Men may use this speech in *England*, concerning the State, *The Lord bless thee, O Habitation of Justice*: And concerning the Church, *The Lord bless thee, O Mountain of Holiness*. And it was the prayer of a good Man, that this Parliament (the repairer of Breeches; the restorer of Paths to dwell in) by Loyalty to their Majesties; Fidelity to the Kingdom, and Zeal to Religion, may be the joy of many Generations.

And

And I perſwade my ſelf, that he Loves and Honours the King moſt, and fixeth the Crown Immoveably upon him and his Poſterity, that wiſheth and endeavoureth for theſe things, though he renounce *Paſſive Obedience*.

I am very ſenſible, that they who juſtifie a King's Proceedings, are in no great danger, tho they Err. But he that ſpeaks againſt Tyranny, if he ſlips in the leaſt, hath preſently Adverſaries that aggravate his humane Frailties. (For who Errs not in ſome things?)

Again, Truth in this Controverſie muſt be handled with all care and circumſpection imaginable, leſt we give Offence. Whereas, they who plead for the King, though never ſo weakly, are bold, and never Condemned for careleſs Expreſſions. I may run great hazard in ſpeaking freely, though it be Truth. But I think a ſlaviſh Life is not worth enjoying. I am for no Peace with *Rome*: But may God's Church and the *Engliſh* Government for ever proſper. And I ſhall end with the ſaying of St. *Auguſtin*,

Domine Deus, quæcunq; dixi, de tuo, agnoſcant & tui: Siqua de meo, & tu ignoſce, & tui. Amen.

FINIS.